

Attachment to Independent Case Review Report
For CDRU # 6352 Case file # 95-251947.

Material Examiner: Malone (RQ)

Remarks:

Case resulted in trial, transcript not provided.

CRM - 11272

INDEPENDENT CASE REVIEW REPORT

Independent Review conducted by: Steve Robertson

Area(s) of Expertise: Hair and Fibers

Review commenced at: 8:45 AM (Time), 11/08/01 (Date)

File #: 95-251947

Laboratory #(s): 21008055
21008053

Examiner(s) & Symbols

	Reviewed	Not Reviewed		Reviewed	Not Reviewed
<u>RQ</u>	<u>X</u> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u> </u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>VN</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>X</u> <input type="checkbox"/>	<u> </u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u> </u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u> </u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Materials Reviewed

Trial testimony transcript(s) of: not provided

Testimony Date(s): Pages:

Laboratory Report(s):

Laboratory Number:	<u>21008055</u>	Date:	<u>Nov 10, 1982</u>
Laboratory Number:	<u>21008053</u>	Date:	<u>Dec 9, 1982</u>
Laboratory Number:	<u> </u>	Date:	<u> </u>

Examiner Bench Notes of: RQ and unknown technicians

Laboratory Number: 21008055
21008053

Page 1 of 3

Initials: SRM

CRM - 11273

Was any other material reviewed? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please identify and/or describe the material: submitting agency letters, both dated 10-7-82

Results of Review

File #: 95-251947 Item or Specimen # Reviewed: Q1-Q14, K1- K3, Q18-Q22, K3,

K4, K7, K8, K9, K10, K15, K16, K18, K19, K22, K23

Review of Laboratory Report(s) and Bench Notes:

Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses

- 1) Did the examiner perform the appropriate tests in a scientifically acceptable manner, based on the methods, protocols, and analytic techniques available at the time of the original examination(s)?
☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Unable to Determine
- 2) Are the examination results set forth in the laboratory report(s) supported and adequately documented in the bench notes?
☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unable to Determine

Review of Testimony:

Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses

☒ Transcript not available.

- 3) Testimony consistent with the laboratory report(s)? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine
- 4) Testimony consistent with the bench notes? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine
- 5) Testimony within bounds of examiner's expertise? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine

Page 2 of 3

Initials: SM

Comments

(Set forth by above question #, if applicable.
Use "Additional Comments" Sheet, if needed)

File #: 95-251947

#1: With microscopic hair comparison, one cannot determine from the notes that the examination was conducted in an appropriate manner.

#2: Documentation is poor. The notes are not dated or initialed and are in pencil instead of ink. Abbreviations are used that are difficult to interpret. Some of the hair recovered from the Q items are marked as "NSFC".


Presumably, this means "Not Suitable for Comparison", but there is no documentation as to why these hair are unsuitable. The technicians do not document the recovery of hair from any of the Q items as stated in the report.

From the documentation, it cannot be determined if the examiner looked at items Q18-Q21, yet he reports that no Caucasian hair was found in these items.

Review completed at: 9:30 AM (Time), 11/08/01 (Date)

Total time spent conducting review (to nearest 1/4 hour): 0.75 hr.

I hereby certify that I conducted this review in an independent, unbiased manner and that the results of my review are fully documented on this report consisting of a total of 3 pages.


(Signature)

11/08/2001

(Date)

Page 3 of 3

Initials: SR